1	DAVID C. SHONKA			
2	Acting General Counsel			
3	KATHERINE WORTHMAN, DC Bar No. 488800			
4	IOANA RUSU, DC Bar No. 1001603 Federal Trade Commission			
5	600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Mailstop CC-10232			
6	Washington, D.C. 20580			
7	Phone: (202) 326-2929 (Worthman) Facsimile: (202) 326-3768			
8	Email: kworthman@ftc.gov (Worthman); irusu@ftc.gov (Rusu)			
9	Colin Hector, CA Bar No. 281795			
10	Federal Trade Commission 901 Market Street, Suite 570			
11	San Francisco, CA 94103 Phone: (415) 848-5100 Facsimile: (415) 848-5184			
12				
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION			
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
15	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA San Francisco Division			
16		1		
17	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,			
18	Plaintiff,	Case No		
19	2 24021222,	COMPLAINT FOR PERMANENT		
20	V.	INJUNCTION AND OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF		
21	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,			
22	a Delaware corporation,			
23	Defendant.			
24		1		
25	Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission	("Commission" or "FTC"), for its Complaint		
26	alleges:			
27 27	1. The FTC brings this action under	Section 13(b) of the Federal Trade Commission		
$\begin{bmatrix} 27 \\ 28 \end{bmatrix}$	Act ("FTC Act"), 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), to obtain to	emporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive		
۷۵				
	COMPLAINT			

Uber Lawsuit

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

relief, rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, disgorgement of ill-gotten monies, and other equitable relief for Defendant's acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), in connection with its false, misleading, or unsubstantiated claims regarding driver earnings and its Vehicle Solutions Program.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337(a), and 1345, and 15 U.S.C. §§ 45(a) and 53(b).
- 3. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1), (b)(2), (c)(2), and (d), and 15 U.S.C. § 53(b).

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

4. Defendant markets its services throughout the United States, including throughout the county of San Francisco.

PLAINTIFF

- 5. The FTC is an independent agency of the United States Government created by statute. 15 U.S.C. §§ 41-58. The FTC enforces Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), which prohibits unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce.
- 6. The FTC is authorized to initiate federal district court proceedings, by its own attorneys, to enjoin violations of the FTC Act and to secure such equitable relief as may be appropriate in each case, including rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies. 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b) and 56(a)(2)(A).

DEFENDANT

7. Defendant Uber Technologies Inc. ("Uber" or "Defendant") is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in San Francisco, California. Defendant is a mobile ride-hailing business and transacts or has transacted business in this district and throughout the United States.

COMMERCE

8. At all times material to this Complaint, Defendant has maintained a substantial course of trade in or affecting commerce, as "commerce" is defined in Section 4 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 44.

UBER'S BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

Overview

- 9. Uber distributes a mobile software application (the "App") that connects entrepreneurial consumers who are transportation providers (hereinafter "Uber Drivers" or "Drivers") with consumers seeking those services (hereinafter "passengers" or "customers"). Uber recruits and approves consumers to become Uber Drivers, sets the rates that Drivers charge for providing transportation, and collects a portion of the fares that Drivers charge for each ride. To maximize its revenue, Uber must amass a sufficient supply of Drivers to meet passengers' transportation demands.
- 10. Since at least May 2014, to recruit consumers to drive for Uber, Uber has disseminated or caused to be disseminated advertisements encouraging consumers to become Uber Drivers on various websites, including but not limited to Craigslist.com and Uber's own website. In its advertisements, Uber claims that Uber Drivers can earn specific high hourly and yearly earnings. Notwithstanding these representations, in many instances Drivers have not earned the high earnings touted by Uber.
- an auto program, known as Uber's "Vehicle Solutions Program," which connects prospective Drivers with auto companies to buy or lease a vehicle they can use to drive for Uber. Uber has made numerous claims touting the low cost and unlimited mileage of its auto program, even though Uber has had no basis with which to make these claims. Indeed, the company has had no oversight of, nor has the company monitored, the terms and conditions of its Drivers' auto agreements through the Vehicle Solutions Program. Further, Drivers in Uber's Vehicle Solutions Program which has connected Drivers with subprime auto companies and dealers –

have in many instances received worse than industry average rates, made payments for hundreds of dollars more per month than advertised, and entered into leases imposing costs for mileage.

12. Uber's earnings and auto claims have enticed numerous consumers to become Uber Drivers and purchase or lease vehicles through Uber's Vehicle Solutions Program. Based on Uber's representations, consumers have paid at least \$1,000 to enter into leases or retail installment contracts for new or used vehicles at higher costs and worse terms than those advertised. When Uber's promised earnings have not materialized, and Drivers have attempted to cancel their auto agreements, they have incurred significant monetary harm. Uber has collected significant revenues from its Drivers' fares, including tens of millions of dollars from Drivers participating in the Vehicle Solutions Program. Uber's practices have caused its Drivers to suffer millions of dollars of injury.

How Uber Works

- 13. Passengers book transportation services from an Uber Driver using a publicly available version of the Uber App that can be downloaded to a smartphone. When a passenger submits a transportation request through the Uber App, the request is transmitted to the nearest available Driver signed into the App. Once a Driver has accepted a request, the App alerts the customer of the Driver's name and vehicle information and facilitates passenger pick-up. Following completion of the trip, Uber bills the cost of the trip to the customer. Uber later remits a portion of the amount it collects to the Driver, after deducting any fees that Uber collects.
- 14. Uber offers multiple transportation service options to its customers, including a relatively lower cost option called "uberX" as well as higher cost options such as "UberSelect," "UberBlack," and UberSUV." The majority of Uber Drivers provide their own vehicles.
- 15. For each service option available, Uber has set minimum standards that its Drivers' vehicles must meet in order to qualify for use with Uber. These standards vary per service option and city. For example, an uberX Driver in New York City must have a vehicle that is model year 2010 or later and seats at least four passengers comfortably, while an UberBlack Driver must have a 2010 or later luxury vehicle that seats at least six passengers comfortably. In San Francisco, an uberX vehicle must be model year 2001 or later and also must

3

5

6

4

7

9

8

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

seat four passengers comfortably, while an UberBlack vehicle must be model year 2010 or later and a luxury sedan that seats six people comfortably.

- 16. Uber has classified its Drivers as independent contractors, not employees. Drivers have paid all expenses associated with operating a car service, including using their own cars and paying for all gas and tolls.
- 17. Uber has set the Drivers' fares for each service option in each city based on Uber's own formula, calculated using either a per-mile rate or a per-minute rate on top of a base fare. Uber charges a service fee for each trip, which Uber has calculated as a percentage of the Drivers' total fare for the trip, usually 20%. Prior to calculating its service fee, Uber also has charged each Driver a one dollar "safe-rides" fee to cover the cost of screening Drivers and cars for safety. Uber has deducted these fees from the amount remitted to the Driver each week.

Defendant's Earnings Claims

- 18. To induce individuals to become Uber Drivers, Uber has advertised and marketed the earning potential of its Drivers on Craigslist, its company website, and other advertising and marketing media. Uber has publicized high annual and hourly earnings to entice consumers to become Uber Drivers. However, once Drivers have begun to receive their paychecks, Drivers have discovered their actual earnings were substantially less than Uber has claimed.
- 19. For example, from at least May 2014 until August 2015, Uber published a statement from the CEO on its website titled, "An Uber Impact: 20,000 Jobs Created On The Uber Platform Every Month." In this post, Uber claimed that its uberX Drivers' "median income is more than \$90,000/year/driver in New York and more than \$74,000/year/driver in San Francisco." Multiple news sources disseminated this statement, including Businessinsider.com, CNBC.com, Forbes.com, and Slate.com. In August 2015, Uber revised the CEO's entry on its website so that the post reads: "[T]he potential income a driver on uberX can make in a year is more than \$90,000 in New York and more than \$74,000 in San Francisco."
- 20. Notwithstanding these representations, for at least the year preceding the CEO's statement (May 2013-May 2014), the median uberX Driver in New York City earned \$29,000 less annually than Uber claimed and the median uberX Driver in San Francisco earned \$21,000

1	less annually than Uber claimed in its website post when Drivers' hours are standardized to a 4		
2	hour work week. Moreover, less than 10 percent of all Drivers in New York and San Francisco		
3	have earned the stated income.		
4	21. Uber has inflated its hourly Drivers' earnings in job listings as well. For example		
5	from at least January 2015 through March 2015, Uber represented in Craigslist advertisements		
6	that its Drivers make high hourly rates in cities across the country even when working flexible		
7	and part-time hours. Specifically, Uber placed the following advertisements for Driver position		
8	in various markets:		
9	a. "Make \$16/hour" in Atlanta, GA;		
10	b. "Make \$16/hour" in Baltimore, MD;		
11	c. "Make \$25/hour" in Boston, MA;		
12	d. "Make \$21/hour" in Chicago, IL;		
13	e. "Make \$15/hour" in Dallas, TX;		
14	f. "Make \$20/hour" in Denver, CO;		
15	g. "Make \$17/hour" in Houston, TX;		
16	h. "Make \$20/hour" in Los Angeles, CA;		
17	i. "Make \$16/hour" in Miami, FL;		
18	j. "Make \$18/hour" in Minneapolis, MN;		
19	k. "Make \$21/hour" in New Jersey;		
20	l. "Make \$20/hour" in Orange County, CA;		
21	m. "Make \$25/hour" in Philadelphia, PA;		
22	n. "Make \$20/hour" in Phoenix, AZ;		
23	o. "Make \$20/hour" in San Diego, CA;		
24	p. "Make \$29/hour" in San Francisco, CA; and		
25	q. "Make \$21/hour" in Washington, DC.		
26	22. As with its website post, Uber's representations in these Craigslist advertisement		
27	overstate Drivers' earnings as higher than the median hourly earnings in these markets. For		
28	example, Uber's data on hourly earnings indicates that, in Boston, Minneapolis, and,		

Philadelphia, for the four weeks preceding January 5, 2015, for all Drivers in each of those cities, fewer than 10% of Drivers averaged Uber's promised hourly rate. In 14 additional cities, for all Drivers in each of those cities, fewer than 30% of Drivers averaged Uber's promised hourly rate:

City	Craigslist Advertisement Quoted Hourly Fare	Percent of Drivers Averaging Quoted Hourly Fare
Atlanta	\$16	Fewer than 30%
Baltimore	\$16	Fewer than 20%
Boston	\$25	Fewer than 10%
Chicago	\$21	Fewer than 20%
Dallas	\$15	Fewer than 30%
Denver	\$20	Fewer than 20%
Houston	\$17	Fewer than 30%
Los Angeles	\$20	Fewer than 20%
Miami	\$16	Fewer than 50%
Minneapolis	\$18	Fewer than 10%
New Jersey	\$21	Fewer than 30%
Orange County	\$20	Fewer than 20%
Philadelphia	\$25	Fewer than 10%
Phoenix	\$20	Fewer than 30%
San Diego	\$20	Fewer than 20%
San Francisco	\$29	Fewer than 20%
Seattle	\$20	Fewer than 30%
Washington, D.C.	\$21	Fewer than 20%

23. During and after the time period Uber has made these unsubstantiated earnings claims, in many markets, most Drivers have not made the claimed amount. In many instances, Drivers have not made the promised amounts even when factoring in non-hourly earnings, such

as payments for time-limited promotions and other incentives. These promotions and incentives often have been contingent on working specific late-night hours, accepting a minimum percentage of trip requests, completing a set number of trip requests within a limited time period, driving in a certain geographic area, or fulfilling other requirements.

Defendant's Vehicle Solutions Program

- 24. Since at least November 2013, Uber has induced consumers to become Uber Drivers by touting its Vehicle Solutions Program through its marketing materials. Uber has directed prospective and current Drivers interested in the program to specific auto companies, and often to specific employees at auto dealerships. Uber has entered into contracts with three subprime auto companies to offer auto deals to Uber Drivers as part of the program. Auto payments are deducted automatically from Drivers' total weekly fares, before any earnings are remitted to the Uber Driver.
- 25. From November 2013 to April 2015, over 5,000 Drivers entered into deals with one of the three auto companies through Uber's program, with nearly all Drivers entering into that company's four-year "lease-to-own financing option" available only to Uber Drivers. To participate in this program, Drivers are required to pay at least \$1,000 for a down payment and \$1,000 for security deposit, which many Drivers have elected to distribute over the lease term.
- 26. The two other auto companies have financed vehicle sales for Uber Drivers through Uber's Vehicle Solutions Program exclusively using retail installment contracts. One company participated in the program from November 2013 to May 2015, and the other company participated from November 2013 until at least April 2016. Drivers first have entered into retail installment contracts to purchase vehicles with the dealerships, and the dealerships have then assigned or transferred the contracts to one of these two finance companies. Since November 2013, one company has funded over 1,500 financing contracts, and the other company has funded over 400 financing contracts for Uber Drivers.

Defendant's Auto Finance Representations

- 27. Uber has made a number of claims about the terms and conditions of its Vehicle Solutions Program.
- 28. For example, Uber has disseminated or caused to be disseminated advertisements touting the low cost of using its Vehicle Solutions Program to obtain a vehicle. For example, Uber has stated that consumers could "own a car for as little as \$20/day" (\$140/week); or lease a car with "payments as low as \$17 per day" (\$119/week), and "starting at \$119/week," with the ability to purchase the vehicle for only \$1 at the end of the lease period. Further, Uber has claimed in marketing materials directed at prospective and current Drivers that it "connects drivers with any kind of credit history to the best financing options available." Uber has described these "financing options" to include financing contracts as well as a "lease-to-own financing option."
- 29. Uber also has represented in its marketing material that Drivers opting to lease cars through its Vehicle Solutions Program would have "unlimited miles."
- 30. Uber has not had any basis for making these claims. Uber has not collected, received, or monitored any Driver-specific data regarding the terms of its Vehicle Solutions Program. Indeed, when Drivers have complained to Uber about the Program, Uber repeatedly has responded with the following or a substantially similar note:

Please contact your lender to discuss your payments, accruals, or amounts owed[,] as Uber does not keep track of this information. The lender indicates your weekly payment and we assist the lender in deducting that payment.

31. Despite the claims that Drivers can make low weekly payments, the median weekly payment for Uber Drivers who entered into a lease from late 2013 through at least April 2015 has been over \$200, while the median weekly payment for Uber Drivers who opted to purchase their vehicles through Uber's Vehicle Solutions Program during the same time period has been over \$160. Further, information Uber had at the time it made the claims indicate that the claims are false. Uber's communications with at least one auto company have acknowledged payment terms and conditions that are inconsistent with Uber's promises to Drivers.

1	
2	v
3	tl
4	h
5	tl
6	s
7	s
8	h
9	
10	iı
11	$\ _{\mathbf{r}}$

18 19

17

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

- 32. And Drivers in Uber's Vehicle Solutions Program – which has connected Drivers vith subprime auto companies and dealers – have in many instances received worse interest rates han industry averages, contrary to Uber's promise to connect Drivers with any type of credit istory to the best financing available. Uber's marketing material to dealers has acknowledged hat the lease-to-own option was a "one size fits all" product with an "implied APR of 19.5%," significantly higher than even the industry average interest rates for consumers with deep ubprime credit scores. Additionally, the average rate of the other auto deals for Uber Drivers as been higher than the industry average for consumers with similar credit scores. Numerous Drivers who have purchased cars through Uber's Vehicle Solutions Program have received nterest rates on their retail installment contracts that are more than double the industry average rate for consumers with similar credit scores.
- 33. Further, despite Uber's unlimited mileage claims, the leases imposed annual mileage limits of 37,500 and 40,000. Specifically, Drivers' leases have provided that Drivers who elect to end the leases early, due to any reason including discovering that they are not earning amounts promised by Uber or termination by Uber, and who surrender the car rather than purchase it outright, are obligated to pay an excess mileage charge of \$.20 per mile for any mileage over the set limit.

VIOLATIONS OF THE FTC ACT

34. Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), prohibits "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce." Misrepresentations or deceptive omissions of material fact constitute deceptive acts or practices prohibited by Section 5(a) of the FTC Act.

COUNT I

Deceptive Income Claims in Violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act

35. In numerous instances in connection with the advertising, marketing, and promotion of its Driver positions, Defendant has represented, expressly or by implication, that consumers in specific cities are likely to earn substantial income, including specific annual and hourly amounts, as set forth in Paragraphs 19 and 21.

1	36.
2	misleading,
3	37.
4	Complaint
5	
6	<u>Dec</u>
7	38.
8	promotion
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	39.
15	misleading,
16	40.
17	Complaint
18	
19	Dec
20	41.
21	promotion (
22	consumers
23	Vehicle Sol
24	42.
25	misleading,
26	43.
27	Complaint
28	
	COMPLA

- 36. In many instances, the representations set forth in Paragraph 35 are false, nisleading, or were not substantiated at the time the representations were made.
- 37. Therefore, the making of the representations as set forth in Paragraph 35 of this Complaint constitutes deceptive acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act.

COUNT II

Deceptive Auto Finance Claims in Violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act

- 38. In numerous instances in connection with the advertising, marketing, and promotion of its Driver positions, Defendant has represented, expressly or by implication, that:
 - a. consumers are likely to own or lease a vehicle for an inexpensive daily or weekly amount such as: "Starting at \$119/week," "For as little as \$20/day," and "For as low as \$17 per day;"
 - b. Defendant connects Drivers with any kind of credit history to the best financing or leasing options available.
- 39. In many instances, the representations set forth in Paragraph 38 are false, misleading, or were not substantiated at the time the representations were made.
- 40. Therefore, the making of the representations as set forth in Paragraph 38 of this Complaint constitutes deceptive acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act.

COUNT III

Deceptive Unlimited Mileage Claims in Violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act

- 41. In numerous instances in connection with the advertising, marketing, and promotion of its Driver positions, Defendant has represented, expressly or by implication, that consumers would have "Unlimited Mileage" when leasing a vehicle through Defendant's Vehicle Solutions Program.
- 42. In many instances, the representations set forth in Paragraph 41 are false, misleading, or were not substantiated at the time the representations were made.
- 43. Therefore, the making of the representations as set forth in Paragraph 41 of this Complaint constitutes deceptive acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act.

CONSUMER INJURY

44. Consumers have suffered and will continue to suffer substantial injury as a result of Defendant's violations of the FTC Act. In addition, Defendant has been unjustly enriched as a result of its unlawful acts or practices. Absent injunctive relief by this Court, Defendant is likely to continue to injure consumers, reap unjust enrichment, and harm the public interest.

THIS COURT'S POWER TO GRANT RELIEF

43. Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), empowers this Court to grant injunctive and other such relief as the Court may deem appropriate to halt and redress violations of any provision of law enforced by the FTC. The Court, in the exercise of its equitable jurisdiction, may award ancillary relief, including rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies, to prevent and remedy any violation of any provision of law enforced by the FTC.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff FTC, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, § 53(b), and the Court's own equitable powers, requests that the Court:

- A. Enter such preliminary and ancillary relief as may be necessary to avert the likelihood of consumer injury during the pendency of this action and to preserve the possibility of effective final relief, including, but not limited to, a temporary and preliminary injunction, an evidence preservation order, and expedited discovery;
- B. Enter a permanent injunction to prevent future violations of the FTC Act by Defendant;
- C. Award such relief as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to consumers resulting from Defendant's violations of the FTC Act, including, but not limited to, rescission and reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of illgotten monies;
- D. Award Plaintiff the costs of bringing this action, as well as such other and additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper.

Case 4:17-cv-00261-JST Document 1 Filed 01/19/17 Page 13 of 13

1		
2		
3	Dated:1/19/2017	Respectfully submitted,
4		David C. Shonka Acting General Counsel
5		
6		/s/Katherine Worthman Katherine Worthman
7		(Phone: 202-326-2929)
8		(E-mail: kworthman@ftc.gov) Ioana Rusu
9		(Phone: 202-326-2077) (Email: irusu@ftc.gov)
10		
11		Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		